

Transforming Joint Training

The Office of the Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for Readiness discusses the Training Capabilities Analysis of Alternatives study.

By Dan Gardner and Fred Hartman

Recent events have highlighted the need for the Department of Defense to continue to close the deficiencies, or gaps, between current training needs and current capabilities for the new joint operational environments.

Lessons learned from Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom demonstrate joint and coalition operations will be the norm, rather than the exception, in the future-and we must continue to improve the way forces train for all phases of conflict. Indeed, these operations create an urgency to expand the definition of joint training to one that includes interagency, intergovernmental and multinational partners and more effectively uses innovative technologies.

In December 2002, the Office of the Secretary of Defense issued Program Decision Memorandum 1, Joint Simulation System (JSIMS), directing an analysis of alternatives (AoA) to identify a cost-effective method for meeting joint and service training requirements.

The detailed Training Capabilities (TC) AoA Final Report, completed under the oversight of a senior steering group led by Dr. David Chu, undersecretary of defense for personnel and readiness (USD(P&R)) and Admiral Edmund Giambastiani, commander, U.S. Joint Forces Command (USJFCOM), was delivered on July 30, 2004 to the undersecretary of defense for acquisition, technology and logistics.

The TC AoA is considered "For Official Use Only" as a result of the cost and cost-benefit analyses chapters-however, we can share with our military, industry and academic partners some detailed observations and corrective actions that are beginning to shape our road ahead in joint training.

Collaborative Process

The TC AoA Study Team, led by OUSD(P&R) and USJFCOM, was composed of members of the Joint Staff (J7), representative combatant commands (COCOMs) and the services. In the course of the study, the team identified and prioritized gaps in current U.S. joint training capabilities. The TC AoA also looked beyond the current training systems to gain insights on how effectively we train our future joint forces. During a February 2004 TC AoA industry strategy game, we solicited the community's views on advanced technological solutions and business approaches to help eliminate the capability gaps. The industry participants provided valuable insights that challenged and helped improve our early assumptions, better focusing our subsequent analysis effort on how to proceed in

acquisition and to incorporate other innovative training methodologies beyond large-scale simulations.

With extensive participation by department, industry and academic experts, this collaborative effort examined training processes in a rigorous study context and provided an excellent base case for current training systems and programs of record, with a solid set of recommendations to guide the future of joint and service training.

The TC AoA included five broad areas of findings, observations and recommendations: management and oversight, training simulations, re-engineering joint training, innovative acquisition approaches and integration of intelligence community.

Management and Oversight

Management and oversight, more than technology, caused serious shortcomings in our prior joint training simulation efforts. The department learned some valuable lessons regarding joint acquisition program management and oversight from the JSIMS program.

Accordingly, the AoA study team recommended three actions: oversight of post-AoA actions transition to the Training Transformation (T2) Executive Steering Group, which occurred on August 1, 2004; a Joint Requirements Office for training simulations be established and located at USJFCOM; and Joint Training Functional Capabilities Board (FCB) under the Joint Capability Integration and Development System be established.

There is overwhelming concern that Joint training capabilities have not been sufficiently addressed in the Joint requirements process. A Joint Training FCB was established in an independent action by the Joint Staff to review the services' training system acquisition and ensure they were interoperable to the degree required to support joint operations.

The Joint Training FCB will also provide training technologies in the formal defense science and technology and research and development programs, by supplying joint training with a sponsor in the science and technology process, and after the Joint Training Functional Concept document is approved, a chapter in the Warfighting Science and Technology Plan.

The FCB Board is chaired by U.S. Air Force Major General Jack Catton, director of operational plans and joint force development, Joint Staff (J-7); U.S. Marine Corps Major General Jon Gallinetti, commander of the Joint Warfighting Center/USJFCOM (J7); and Dan Gardner, director of readiness and training, policy and programs.

The Joint Training FCB met for the first time in September and is addressing Joint training capability needs across the Department.

Training Simulations

The department must enable evolutionary enhancements to constructive and other training simulation programs. Two actions are being considered. USJFCOM, in addition to assuming the leadership for joint simulation requirements, will improve and develop simulations for joint federations to support joint training exercises with a series of technical spiral developments to address identified training gaps. The USJFCOM will develop tools to enhance joint training federations to include common data, terrain, after-action review, run-time infrastructure, and command, control, communications and computers intelligence (C4I) interfaces.

We will minimize the number of joint training federations to two initially, with a target of one. However, the current Joint Training Confederation will be maintained to support Ulchi Focus Lens Exercise requirements until FY07.

Re-engineering Joint Training

Current joint training has been based largely on training exercises supported by large-scale constructive simulations. The department must offer alternative training methodologies to provide more cost-effective and training solutions, particularly for the COCOMs and joint task forces.

We are examining three strategies to help close this gap: conduct a rapid turnaround "trade study" in FY05 for re-engineering overall joint training to identify more effective and efficient training delivery methods; determine and develop innovative training methodologies to meet COCOM needs for highly tailorable capabilities to train individuals and staffs for Standing Joint Task Force Headquarters assignment; and assist the COCOMs by establishing assessment and evaluation models that highlight the tradeoffs inherent in managing training as conflicting constraints arise with competing training objectives, performance standards and training tool capabilities.

Innovative Acquisition Approaches

The training audience must be able to buy its training systems faster and cheaper to help it better respond to asymmetric threats and other challenges on the 21st century battlefield.

Accordingly, the study recommended we conduct an acquisition prototype selected by the TC AoA and hosted by U.S. Special Operations Command for joint close air support training. This prototype is planned to commence in FY06.

Integration of Intelligence Community

For the department to train as it will fight, it must more fully include the intelligence community as part of the warfighting training audience.

Under consideration to close this gap are several initiatives, including one which will have the undersecretary of defense for intelligence lead an effort to integrate and develop a Joint National Intelligence Training Federation (JNITF) of simulations. The USJFCOM Joint Warfighting Center will integrate the JNITF with other joint training simulations through its joint development and integration facility.

The Road Ahead

In June 2004, the steering group approved the TC AoA study team's recommendations for inclusion in the final report. This blends the above elements into a single course of action for the future of joint training.

In order to meet the current and forecasted gaps in joint and service training, the steering group-recommended course of action provides for a clear management and oversight structure, enhancements to modeling and simulations to close COCOM training gaps, selected alternative training methodologies, a comprehensive study to re-engineer joint training, an innovative acquisition prototype and more fully including the intelligence community in joint training.

Detailed implementation of this course of action will be accomplished under T2 Executive Steering Group oversight and prepared for the program review process.

DoD is moving forward in a collaborative manner to re-engineer joint training, and the study's recommendations provide direction. Even with this progress, we require and welcome the support and contributions of DoD's military, industry and academic partners to address a number of other joint training challenges. In particular, we look for technical and policy solutions to expand communication bandwidth to satisfy the collective needs of training and operational audiences and overcome multi-level security impediments in our operations (and training and exercises), whereby requisite classified information may flow more easily between the United States, NATO and other multinational partners' units.

Industry should be aware that we are considering the full spectrum of technologies to re-engineer joint training. In particular, we see increased potential in a number of untapped or emerging technologies, including embedded training, massively multiplayer online games, and "light" simulations to help close our joint training gaps

Our progress in addressing the shortfalls identified in the TC AoA study will enhance the department's vision for Training Transformation, which directs us to provide dynamic, capabilities-based training for the Department of Defense in support of national security requirements across the full spectrum of service, joint, interagency, intergovernmental and multinational operations.

Editor's Note: Dan Gardner is director of readiness and training, policy and programs within the Office of the Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for Readiness. Fred Hartman is associate director for training and simulation within the same office and is the director of the Joint Analysis and Assessment Capability Office.